

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

LINTECH GLOBAL, INC., Petitioner, vs. VERSAPRO GROUP, LLC, Respondent.	2:21-CV-10316-TGB-DRG ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION GRANTING IN PART AND DENYING IN PART PETITIONER’S MOTION TO ENFORCE JUDGMENT AND FOR CONTEMPT AND DENYING RESPONDENT’S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS
--	---

This matter is before the Court on Magistrate Judge David R. Grand’s October 12, 2021 Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 42), recommending that LinTech’s Motion to Hold Versapro in Contempt (ECF No. 6) be granted in part and Versapro’s Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions (ECF No. 30) be denied.

The Court has reviewed the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation and finds that it is well-reasoned and supported by the applicable law. The law provides that either party may serve and file written objections “[w]ithin fourteen days after being served with a copy” of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). The district

court will make a “de novo determination of those portions of the report...to which objection is made.” *Id.*

Where, as here, neither party objects to the report, the district court is not obligated to independently review the record. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149-52 (1985). The Court will, therefore, accept the Magistrate’s Judge’s Report and Recommendation of December 10, 2021, as this Court’s findings of fact and conclusions of law.

Accordingly, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Magistrate Judge Grand’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 42) is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED**. It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Petitioner’s Motion to Enforce the Injunction and Judgment and Hold Respondent in Contempt (ECF No. 6) is **GRANTED in part and DENIED in part** and Respondent’s Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions (ECF No. 30) is **DENIED**, as set out below:

- (1) Petitioner’s Motion to Enforce the Injunction and Judgment is **GRANTED** as specifically provided in the recommendations contained in the Report and Recommendation, which are hereby **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** as the **ORDER** of this Court;
- (2) Petitioner’s Motion to Hold Respondent in Contempt is **DENIED** and the recommendation of the Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** as the **ORDER** of this Court;
- (3) Respondent’s Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions (ECF No. 30) is **DENIED** and the recommendation of the Report and Recommendation is **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** as the **ORDER** of this Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 21, 2022 s/Terrence G. Berg

TERRENCE G. BERG
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE